

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION

UNITED STATES

v.

CRIMINAL NO. 3:19-cr-73-DCB-LRA

BOBBY JOSEPH STALLWORTH

DEFENDANT

ORDER

BEFORE THE COURT is Bobby Joseph Stallworth's ("Defendant") Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release ("Motion"). [ECF No. 33]. The Court, having examined the Motion, the record, the applicable legal authority, and being fully informed in the premises, finds as follows:

On August 22, 2019, Defendant pleaded guilty to possessing a firearm in violation of 18 U.S.C. § 922(g)(1). [ECF No. 31] at 1. He was sentenced to 35 months in prison followed by three years of supervised release. Id. at 2-3. Defendant has currently served over two years of his supervised release and has filed a Motion for Early Termination of Supervised Release pursuant to 18 U.S.C. 3583(e)(1). [ECF No.33]. Defendant claims the Court should modify his sentence because he has complied with the conditions of his supervised release, completed his state probation without any infractions, transitioned through the Veteran Affairs program, obtained stable employment, and completed MSAP classes which enabled him to reinstate his

driver's license. Id. Defendant filed this motion in January of 2025, and the Government has not responded.

Under 18 U.S.C. § 3583(e)(1) a district court has the authority to modify conditions of supervised release after the expiration of one year if the court is satisfied that such action is warranted by the conduct of the defendant and the interest of justice. "Mere compliance with the conditions of probation does not warrant early termination of a probation term, as such behavior is required by law." United States v. Payne, No. 1:17-CR-142, 2020 WL 2813438, at *1 (E.D. Tex. May 29, 2020) (citing United States v. Salazar, 693 F. App'x 565, 566 (9th Cir. 2017)). Early termination is typically granted only upon a showing of new or changed circumstances not contemplated during sentencing. Id. Although Defendant argues that his compliance with the conditions of his supervised release and his maintaining steady employment support his request for early termination, he does not identify any new or exceptional circumstances that justify a modification. The Court finds that early termination is unwarranted.

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Defendant's Motion for Early Termination of Probation [ECF No. 33] is DENIED.

SO ORDERED this the 10th day of April, 2025.

/s/ David Bramlette
DAVID C. BRAMLETTE III
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE